

REMARKS

ADMINISTRATIVE OVERVIEW

Claims 1-35 were previously presented. Applicants hereby amend Claims 1 and 18. Thus, Claims 1-35 are pending of which Claims 1 and 18 are independent. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections levied against the pending claims. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

NON-STATUTORY OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1-35 are provisionally rejected under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-35 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/711,646 (“the ‘646 application.”) Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold this rejection in abeyance until allowable subject matter is found in one of either the ‘646 application or the present application.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 12-26 and 30-35

Claims 1-8, 12-26 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 7,089,311 to Devine et al. (“Devine”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0143955 to Shimada et al. (“Shimada.”) Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-8, 12-26 and 30-35 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Devine and Shimada. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 18 to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 1-8, 12-26 and 30-35 are patentable over Devine in view of Shimada.

Prima facie obviousness requires a showing that the cited references, either together or alone, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Devine nor Shimada teaches or suggests maintaining a connection responsive to validating the second ticket, as required by each independent claim.

At best, Devine describes a system where in one embodiment “the identity of the TN3270E client may be authenticated prior to resuming communications with the TN3270E

client over the second TCP/IP connection.” *See* Devine col. 3, lines 19-22. Devine does not teach or even suggest authenticating a ticket, identity or client in order to maintain the connection between the SNA application and the server.

Devine also describes preserving the SNA session between the server and the SNA application by resynchronizing the client and the SNA application using a screen refresh. *See* Devine, col. 9, lines 14-17. Although the SNA screen refresh can include an authentication procedure for authenticating a user, the preservation of the SNA session is accomplished responsive to the screen refresh and not the authentication of the user. *See* Devine, col. 9, lines 23-33. What is more, the SNA screen refresh procedure does not require an authentication, thus preserving the SNA session between the server and the SNA application responsive to a screen refresh does not necessarily mean that a user need be authenticated. *See* col. 7, lines 40-45. Devine therefore does not teach or suggest maintaining a connection responsive to validating a ticket.

Like Devine, Shimada also fails to teach or suggest maintaining a connection responsive to validating the second ticket. While Shimada describes processing network traffic and monitoring client/server sessions to determine whether a session transitions from an open session to a closed session, at no point does Shimada teach or suggest maintaining a connection. *See* Shimada, pages 4-5. Thus, Shimada does not even teach or suggest maintaining a connection.

In light of the above remarks, Claims 1 and 18 are patentable over any combination of Devine and Shimada. Claims 2-8, 12-17, 19-26 and 30-35 are also patentable over Devine and Shimada because Claims 2-8, 12-17, 19-26 and 30-35 depend on and incorporate Claims 1 and 18. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 9-10 and 27-28

Claims 9-10 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Devine in view of Shimada and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,484,206 to Crump et al. (“Crump.”) Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 9-10 and 27-28 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Devine, Shimada and Crump.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 18 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 9-10 and 27-28 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 9-10 and 27-28 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1 and 18. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Crump merely to address the first proxy service comprising a proxy server and a security gateway. Like Devine and Shimada, Crump also fails to teach or suggest maintaining a connection responsive to validating the second ticket. Thus, Crump fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 11 and 29

Claims 11 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Devine in view of Shimada in view of Crump and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 7,010,300 to Jones et al. ("Jones.") Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11 and 29 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Devine, Shimada Crump and Jones.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 18 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 11 and 29 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 11 and 29 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1 and 18. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Jones merely to address a first protocol encapsulating a second protocol. Like Devine, Shimada and Crump, Jones also fails to teach or suggest maintaining a connection responsive to validating the second ticket. Thus, Jones fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and that all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application; the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

Date: February 10, 2010

/Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz
Registration Number: 59,701

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002